REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10-12, 15, and 16 are amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,349,366 (Yamazaki '366) in view of Yamazaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,656 (Yamazaki '656). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither of the applied references individually nor the combination thereof disclose or suggest a driving transistor that controls a current flowing through the electro-optical element, as recited in independent claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 16.

In Yamazaki '366, the liquid crystal display is not a current drive device. That is, the alleged driving transistor described by Yamazaki '366 does not control a current flowing through the electro-optical element. As Yamazaki '366 teaches, a pulse is applied to the selection line in the same manner as the conventional TFTs, whereas a positive or a negative voltage is applied to the data line in accordance to the contents of the data (col. 10, lines 47-50). The distinction between the conventional TFTLCD and the device described by Yamazaki '366 is that a ferroelectric capacitor FE is provided between the source of Tr_1 and the gate electrode of Tr_2 (col. 10, lines 56-61). As Yamazaki '366 describes, the spontaneous polarization of the ferroelectric defines a lower limit for the potential V_1 (col. 10, lines 57-63). As shown in Fig. 1(A) of Yamazaki '366, the conventional TFT (i.e., Tr_2 of Yamazaki '366) does not correspond to a driving transistor that controls a current flowing through the electro-optical element, as recited in independent claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 16. Thus, Yamazaki '366 fails to disclose or suggest the features as recited in independent claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 16.

Yamazaki '656 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yamazaki '366 as applied to independent claims 1, 10-12, 15 and 16.

In Yamazaki '656, the liquid crystal display is not a current drive device. As shown in Fig. 4 of Yamazaki '656, the liquid crystal display device 101 includes a source driver 101-1-1 and a gate driver 101-1-2 that drive a plurality of the pixels in the pixel portion of the active matrix 101-1 (col. 7, lines 5-20). Each of the pixel electrodes (pixel TFTs) described by Yamazaki '656 is fed with the picture signal (gradiation voltage), so that a voltage is applied to the liquid crystal sandwiched between each pixel electrode and the opposite electrode, whereby the liquid crystal is driven (col. 7, lines 50-57). Accordingly, Yamazaki '656 fails to disclose or suggest a driving transistor that controls a current flowing through the electro-optical element, as recited in independent claims 1, 10-12, 15, and 16.

Because none of the applied references, alone or in combination thereof, disclose or suggest all of the features as recited in claims 1, 10-12, 15, and 16, the applied references cannot render obvious the subject matter of claims 2-9, 13, and 14, for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 10 and for the additional features recited therein. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tbm

Date: March 15, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461